

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

BRANDON REAMES, #S15691,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Case No. 22-cv-01832-JPG
)	
SETH WESHINSKY,)	
SERGEANT SAVURT,)	
and EDWARD LEE BRAZZELL,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

GILBERT, District Judge:

This matter is before the Court for case management. Plaintiff Brandon Reames filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on August 11, 2022. (Doc. 1). The First Amended Complaint (Doc. 10) survived screening pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, and Plaintiff was allowed to proceed with claims against Richard Smith, Johnathon Law, and Eric Shaw. (Doc. 19). Waivers of service were sent to these defendants, but returned unexecuted with a notation explaining that these individuals were never employed as officers by the City of Roxana. (Docs. 20 and 21).

Plaintiff was ordered to provide additional identifying information for each defendant. (Docs. 22 and 24). He was warned that failure to do so would result in their dismissal. *Id.* The Court also held a status conference to address the matter on December 5, 2023. (Doc. 26). There, Plaintiff informed the Court, for the first time, that these defendants were generically identified as “Richard Smith,” “Johnathon Law,” and “Eric Shaw.” *Id.* Therefore, the Court ordered Plaintiff to provide specific names for each defendant in a motion to substitute or an amended complaint

within forty-five days, and he was again warned that failure to do so would result in dismissal of unidentified defendants after the deadline expired. *Id.*

On January 3, 2024, Plaintiff identified the defendants in a motion to substitute (Doc. 28) as Officer Seth Weshinsky (in place of Richard Smith), Lieutenant Brazzell (in place of Eric Shaw) and Sergeant Savurt (in place of Johnathon Law). (Doc. 29). Defendants Weshinsky and Brazzell ultimately appeared and answered on April 18, 2024. (Doc. 57). Defendant Savurt did not.

On May 13, 2024, the Court imposed a final deadline of July 9, 2024, for Plaintiff to provide identifying information for Sergeant Savurt. (Docs. 52 and 59). Plaintiff was again warned that his failure to do so by the deadline would result in dismissal of this defendant from the action. (Doc. 59). The final response deadline expired at least one week ago, and Plaintiff has not responded to the Court's Order (Doc. 59) requiring him to name Sergeant Savurt with particularity. Plaintiff has not requested an extension, and the Court will not allow this matter to linger any longer.

Defendant **SERGEANT SAVURT** is **DISMISSED without prejudice** from this action based on Plaintiff's failure to comply with the Court's Order (Doc. 59) to identify this individual by first and last name. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b). The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **TERMINATE SERGEANT SAVURT** as a party in CM/ECF and enter judgment accordingly at the **CLOSE** of this case. The Court will separately enter a Scheduling and Discovery Order as to all remaining claims and defendants.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 16, 2024

s/ J. Phil Gilbert
J. PHIL GILBERT
United States District Judge